

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments. Claims 1, 4-8, 11-23, and 27-30 remain pending in the case. Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 11, 13-23, and 27-30 are rejected. Claims 5 and 12 are objected to. Claims 1, 6, 8, 15, 17, 18, and 23 are amended herein. Claims 5, 12, and 16 are cancelled herein. No new matter has been added.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

In the office action mailed July 7, 2006, Examiner indicated that Claims 5, and 12 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In reliance on Examiner's remarks, Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 so as to substantially include the limitations of dependent Claim 5; and Applicants have amended independent Claim 8 so as to substantially include the limitation of dependent Claims 12. As such, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 11, 13-14, and 31-34.

Additionally, Applicants note that Claims 5 and 12 contain similar limitations. Applicants have amended independent Claim 15 to contain the limitation "***said first packet processor also for receiving a memory reply from said second packet processor corresponding to said memory request for said first packet prior to forwarding a second packet that is ahead of said first packet in said queue;***" and Applicants have amended Claim 23 to contain the limitation "***a means for receiving a memory reply corresponding to said memory request prior to sending said first packet.***" As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 15, 17-23, 27-30, and 35-37 are also in condition for allowance since independent Claims 15 and 23 contains limitations that have been indicated as allowable subject matter.

35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, 13, 23, 27-29, and 31-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,812,799 by Zuravleff, hereinafter referred to as the "Zuravleff" reference. As stated above, Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 8 to include limitations that Examiner has indicated constitute allowable subject matter. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1

and 8 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and are thus in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 4, 6, and 31-32 that depend from Claim 1, and Claims 11, 13, and 33-34 that depend from Claim 8 are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base claims.

With respect to Claims 23, 27-29, and 35-37, Applicants note that Claims 5 and 12 contain similar limitations. Applicants have amended independent Claim 23 so as to add limitations in the spirit of Claims 5 and 12. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Zuravleff fails to teach “*a means for receiving a memory reply corresponding to said memory request prior to sending said first packet*” (emphasis added), as recited in Claim 23. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 23 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and is thus in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 23, 27-29, and 35-37 that depend from Claim 23 are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7, 14, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zuravleff in further view of United States Patent 5,875,466 by Wakerly, hereinafter referred to as the “Wakerly” reference. As stated above, Applicants have amended Claims 1, 8, and 23 to include limitations that Examiner has indicated constitute allowable subject matter. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 1, 8, and 23 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and are thus in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 7 that depends from Claim 1, Claim 14 that depends from Claim 8, and Claim 30 that depends from Claim 23 are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on allowable base claims.

Claims 15-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,542,507 by Khacherian, hereinafter referred to as the “Khacherian” reference in view of Zuravleff. As stated above, Applicants note that Claims 5 and 12 contain similar limitations. Applicants have amended independent Claim 15 so as to add limitations in the spirit of Claims 5 and 12. Thus, Applicants

respectfully assert that Khacherian and Zuravleff, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest “*said first packet processor also for receiving a memory reply from said second packet processor corresponding to said memory request for said first packet prior to forwarding a second packet that is ahead of said first packet in said queue*” (emphasis added), as recited in Claim 15. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 15 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) and is thus in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 17-20 that depend from Claim 15 are also in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Khacherian in view of Zuravleff in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,130 by Hanaoka, hereinafter referred to as the “Hanaoka” reference. Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 15 is allowable over Khacherian and Zuravleff. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Hanaoka does not overcome the shortcomings of Khacherian and Zuravleff. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that that Claim 15 is also allowable over Khacherian, Zuravleff, and Hanaoka, and is thus in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 21 that depends from Claim 15 is also in condition for allowance and being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Khacherian in view of Zuravleff in further view of Wakerly. Based on the above rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 15 is allowable over Khacherian and Zuravleff, alone or in combination. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Wakerly does not overcome the shortcomings of Khacherian and Zuravleff, alone or in combination. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that that Claim 15 is also allowable over Khacherian, Zuravleff, and Wakerly, alone or in combination, and is thus in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 22 that depends from Claim 15 is also in condition for allowance and being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 4, 6-8, 11, 13-15, 17-23, and 27-37 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact William P. O'Meara at (970) 898-7917 if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 8/3/08



James P. Hao

Registration No. 36,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060